

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-25 are rejected. Claims 1, 8, 13 and 14 are amended herein. No new matter has been added. Claims 23-25 are cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-22 remain pending in the case.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0147518 by Albal et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Albal” reference in view of United States Patent 6,597,765 by Ksiazek et al., hereinafter referred to as the “Ksiazek” reference. Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22 are patentable over Albal in view of Ksiazek for the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method of using a telephone identifying information to present information over a telephone interface using a first computer, the method comprising:

selecting at least one voice character prosody setting of a language based on the telephone identifying information, wherein the voice character prosody setting comprises a speech pattern selected from a set of speech patterns, wherein a speech pattern identifies an intonation for presenting said language;
presenting information according to the at least one voice character prosody setting over the telephone interface using the first computer;
identifying a user speech pattern based on a speaking voice of a user;
selecting a second voice character prosody setting of the language based on the user speech pattern; and
subsequently, presenting said information according to the second voice character prosody setting over the telephone interface using the first computer.

Independent Claims 8, 13 and 14 recite similar limitations. Claims 3-5 and 7 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 9-12 that depend from independent Claim, and Claims 15-22 that depend from independent Claim 14 provide further limitations descriptive of the features of the present invention.

Albal and the claimed invention are very different. Applicants understand Albal to teach a method and apparatus for delivering caller identification information to a user. In particular, Albal teaches a method and apparatus wherein a communication node can receive user commands via speech recognition. Applicants respectfully submit that Albal does not show or suggest a method of presenting information over a telephone interface that includes presenting information to the user according to a second voice character prosody setting based on a speech pattern of the user.

For instance, with reference to Figure 9 of Albal, automatic speech recognition (ASR) unit 254 of voice recognition (VRU) server 234 provides speech recognition of speech inputs from the user. ASR unit 254 processes the speech input, and in response to identifying particular speech input, “sends an output signal to implement the specific function associated with the recognized speech pattern” (emphasis added) ([0066]). In particular, VRU server 234 provides the output signals, which represent the result of the speech processing, to LAN 240. LAN 240 routes the output signal to the call control unit 236, the application server 242, and/or the voice browser 250. The communication node 212 then performs a specific function associated with the output signals ([0062]). Albal teaches that the ASR unit converts speech into electronic signals for implementing specific requests of the user.

Applicants respectfully assert that the output signals generated by ASR unit 254 and transmitted by VRU server 234 are electronic signals for activating a specific function of the communication system of Figure 9. In particular, the ASR unit translates the audible speech into electronic signals for implementing an explicit specific application associated with the audible speech. For example, the communication system can place a call to a contact in response to an explicit speech command (i.e., “call Bob at home”). In other words, a speech command (e.g., a request) is identified, and that the explicit speech command is converted into electronic signals for transmission to a particular

application for carrying out the user request. Applicants respectfully assert that the output signals are not audible speech.

In contrast, embodiments of the claimed invention are directed toward a method of presenting information over a telephone interface that includes presenting information to the user according to a second voice character prosody setting based on a speech pattern of the user. Specifically, information is presented to the user using a particular speech pattern based on the user's own speech pattern. For example, as described in the current specification, callers with speech patterns from a particular region of the country may find that after several verbal interactions with the voice portal, the information is presented in a voice character setting using the user's speech pattern (page 36, lines 12-15). In particular, the voice character setting is adapted implicitly, and not in direct response to a specific request of the user.

Applicants respectfully assert that Albal in particular does not teach, disclose, or suggest a method of presenting information over a telephone interface including presenting the information according to the second voice character prosody setting based on the user speech pattern, as claimed. In contrast, Albal teaches using an ASR unit to process speech input and generated output signals for activating specific functions in response to identifying a word or speech pattern. Specifically, by teaching that the ASR unit

implements specific functions in direct relation to identified words and speech patterns, Albal teaches away from such a configuration.

Moreover, the combination of Albal and Ksiazek fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Ksiazek does not overcome the shortcomings of Albal. Ksiazek, alone or in combination with Albal, does not show or suggest a method of presenting information over a telephone interface that includes presenting information to the user according to a second voice character prosody setting based on a speech pattern of the user.

Applicants understand Ksiazek to teach a system and method for multiple language access in a telephone network. Ksiazek teaches that an operator service position system (OSPS) is operable to determine an appropriate language for providing operator services. The appropriate language selection may be based on: a) a dialed number; b) a country code of the dialed number; c) a card billing number; d) Automatic Number Identification (ANI) information; and e) caller input information (col. 3, lines 21-55). In particular, the caller input information is in the form of direct interaction with the keypad of the telephone (col. 3, line 67 through col. 4, line 13). Ksiazek does not teach, describe or suggest the use of voice recognition in assigning the appropriate language. Specifically, by teaching language assignment is based on direct caller input, Ksiazek teaches away from such a configuration.

Applicants respectfully assert that nowhere does the combination of Albal and Ksiazek teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1, 8, 13 and 14 and that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Albal also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 3-5 and 7 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 9-12 that depend from independent Claim 8, and Claims 15-22 that depend from independent Claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3-5, 7, 9-12 and 15-22 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and are in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-22 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.


The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge our deposit account No. 23-0085 for any unpaid fees.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 9 Nov, 2004



Matthew J. Blecher
Registration No. 46,558

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060